

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Applicants have canceled claims 3 and 4 without prejudice.

The Specification has been objected to and Applicants have amended the Specification to include language from the original claims as filed.

Claims 1, 3-12, 14-22, 25 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Keith. In the “Response to Arguments” section of the office action, it appears that this section is misstating Applicants’ argument. For example, as to claims 5, 21 and 22, Applicants did not argue that Keith did not disclose that XML is used as input to the system as stated on page 13 of the office action. Instead, Applicants admitted that “Keith merely describe that XML information is used as “input” to a system.” (Response, page 11). However, what Applicants stated was that Keith does not describe that the knowledge container itself contains XML data blocks but merely receives XML information as input to the system but does not store the data itself in XML format. No such XML based approach appears to be described in Keith. The office action cites column 25, lines 40-45. However, this cited portion again merely states that it is used as “input” to a system not that the raw data itself is in an XML format when put in the knowledge container. Therefore, Keith does not disclose this limitation. Accordingly, these claims are at least allowable for this reason alone.

The independent claims have also been amended to note that the second data descriptor is in the form of at least a data access instruction descriptor that provides instructions on how to access the raw data in the raw data item (see Specification, ¶52). No such data access instruction descriptor is described in the Keith reference and as such, these claims are also in condition for allowance. As noted in Applicants’ prior response, there are other distinguishing features and Applicants respectfully reassert the remarks made in the previous responses.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 19, 2008

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/  
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder Price P.C.  
222 N. LaSalle St., Suite 2600  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-1003  
312/609-7500  
312/609-5005 Facsimile